

Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed February 3, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 3, 2009, Claims 1-2, 4-5, 18, 20, 22-23, 34-38, 40, 42, 54-58, 60, 62-63, and 75 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification and Claims 1, 18, 34, 54, and 75 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 18, 20, and 22-23, and Claims 34-38, 40, and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present response amends Claims 1-2, 4-5, 18, 20, 22-23, 34, 54-58, 60, 62-63, and 75, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-2, 4-5, 18, 20, 22-23, 34-38, 40, 42, 54-58, 60, 62-63, and 75. Claims 8-16, 26-33, 46-53, and 66-73 remain withdrawn, although withdrawn Claims 66-73 have been amended to match the amendments made to similar non-withdrawn claims.

III. Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action mailed February 3, 2009, the Specification was objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, it was asserted that the Specification failed to provide proper antecedent basis for "a machine readable medium" as recited in Claims 54-58, 60, and 62-63. Accordingly, these claims have been amended to recite a "computer readable storage medium," support for which can be found in paragraph [0053] of the printed publication Specification. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 18, 34, 54, and 75 were objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, Claims 1, 18, 34, 54, and 75 have been amended as shown above to address the informalities. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed February 3, 2009, Claims 18, 20, 22-23, 34-38, 40, and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Accordingly, Claims 18 and 34 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18, 20, 22-23, 34-38, 40, and 42-43, as amended, now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicants believe that no fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2009

By: / Nathan L. Feld /
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800